



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/772,256	01/29/2001	Hilarie K. Orman	1909.2.75A	9279

21186 7590 11/27/2006

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.  
P.O. BOX 2938  
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402

EXAMINER
----------

NALVEN, ANDREW L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2134

DATE MAILED: 11/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/772,256

Applicant(s)

ORMAN, HILARIE K.

Examiner

Andrew L. Nalven

Art Unit

2134

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 July 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 and 35-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 and 35-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 19-24, 26 and 32 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.


### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 January 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

  
KAMBIZ ZAND  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-33 and 35-37 are pending.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1-33, 35-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

3. With regards to claims 1 and 35, the cited claim provides for "decrypting the entity identifier with the secret value and the secret value known to the members." It is unclear to the Examiner if there are two secret values or a single secret value. Further, it is unclear to the Examiner which of the secret values is used in the creation of the entity identifier "by encoding the entity name and the secret value...using the secret value."

4. Further, claim 1 provides that each member is "capable of" engaging in the secure connection. Language providing that a system is "capable of" performing a function is indefinite because it is unclear whether Applicant intends the system to actually perform the claimed functionality. Computer systems are capable of performing a multitude of functions and all computer systems may be programmed to perform a

particular function. Examiner suggests an amendment to positively recite that each member perform the steps of engaging in the claimed secure connection.

5. With regards to claims 9-12, 31-33, and 36, the cited claims provide that the entity identifier is creating using a hash function. However, claims 1 and 17 defines that the entity identifier is decrypted. It is unclear to the Examiner how the entity identifier could be hashed and allow decryption to take place because hash functions are invertible and thus it is not possible to revert the hashed entity identifier to the inputs used to create the entity identifier using the hash function.

6. With regards to claim 17, the cited claim provides for "a connection identifier comprising an encoded version of the originally-connected entity name and the secret value." It is unclear to the Examiner if there are two secret values or a single secret value. Further, it is unclear to the Examiner which of the secret values is used in the creation of the connection identifier.

7. Further, claim 17 provides for "acquiring the cryptographic context information using the secret value." It is unclear to the Examiner how this secret value has been made known to the entities in order to allow its use for acquiring the cryptographic context information. As a result, claim 17 is incomplete because it omits essential elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the elements.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

8. Claims 17, 18, 25, 27-31, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bruce Schneier Applied Cryptography.

9. With regards to claims 17, 18, 25, 27-31, and 33, Schneier teaches an originally connected trusted entity which comprises an originally-connected entity name and cryptographic context information, at least one other trusted entity which comprises another entity name, a secret value known to the at least two trusted entities (Schneier, pages 31-34), a connection identifier comprising an encoded version of the originally connected entity name and the secret value and wherein the originally connected entity name encrypted within the connection identifier is linked to the cryptographic context information (Schneier, pages 31-34) and provides a mechanism by which a secure connection can be made to the originally connected trusted entity and wherein each of the at least two trusted entities engage in the secure connection by acquiring the cryptographic context information using the secret value to acquire the originally connected entity name and then the cryptographic context information (Schneier, pages 31-34).

***Allowable Subject Matter***

10. Claims 1-16, 35-37 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

Art Unit: 2134

11. Claims 19-24, 26, and 32 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The cited prior art, Hoke et al US Patent No. 6,701, 437, Bruce Schneier's Applied Cryptography, Owens et al US Patent No. 5,481,611, and newly cited reference Carter US Patent No. 5,787,175 fail to disclose the creation of an entity identifier that is decrypted by a member of a group using a secret value known to all group members to acquire cryptographic context information to allow a secure connection between an originally connected entity and an original endpoint. As a result, the cited prior art fails to anticipate or render obvious the above-cited claims.

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the

Art Unit: 2134

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew L. Nalven whose telephone number is 571 272 3839. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 8-6, Alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on 571 272 3799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.


Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


Application/Control Number: 09/772,256

Page 7

Art Unit: 2134

Andrew Nalven





KAMBIZ ZAND  
PRIMARY EXAMINER